



Keystone Citizen Advisory Group
Meeting No. 5
Pope Marine Building, Port Townsend
October 13, 2004; 5:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Summary

***Note:** This meeting summary represents notes from the Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meeting, and is not a formal transcript or minutes. It is provided for the information of CAG members and other interested parties.*

AGENDA

- I. Opening Remarks; Review 9/30 Meeting Summary
- II. 9/30 Meeting Follow-Up
- III. Traffic Study Results
- IV. Safety Results
- V. Indirect System Costs
- VI. Harbor/Vessel Scenario Screening
- VII. CAG Conversation
- VIII. Next Steps
- IX. Public Comment
- X. Adjourn

ATTENDEES

CAG Members

- ✓ Nancy Conard
- ✓ Forest Shomer
- ✓ Tim McGuire

WSDOT Representative

- ✓ Paula Hammond

Facilitator

- ✓ Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Project Team Members

- ✓ Doug MacDonald, WSF
 - ✓ Bill Greene, WSF
 - ✓ Dana Moreland, WSF
 - ✓ Russ East, WSF
 - ✓ Joy Goldenberg, WSF
 - ✓ Captain Kelly Mitchell, WSF
 - ✓ Ray Deardorf, WSF
 - ✓ Mike Anderson, WSF
 - ✓ Traci Brewer-Rogstad, WSF
 - ✓ Larry Demich, Demich Engineering
 - ✓ Roxanne Oynes, CH2M Hill
 - ✓ Doug Playter, CH2M Hill
 - ✓ Tung Le, CH2M Hill
 - ✓ Erin Pressentin, EnviroIssues
 - ✓ Hadley Greene, EnviroIssues
-

MATERIALS

- Agenda
- 9/30/04 Draft CAG Meeting Summary
- PowerPoint Presentation Slides
- Keystone-Port Townsend 2030 Vehicle Throughput Capacity
- Keystone Harbor Environmental Analysis Update
- Keystone Traffic Analysis
- Keystone Harbor Safety Issues and Concerns
- System Costs and Impacts
- Holding and Queuing Figures

OPENING REMARKS

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, opened the meeting and introduced herself as facilitator for the Washington State Ferries' (WSF) Keystone Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) process. She welcomed the CAG and attendees and introduced Doug MacDonald, Washington State Secretary of Transportation and acting CEO of WSF.

Penny reviewed the legislation that established the CAG and introduced the CAG members and Paula Hammond, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) liaison.

Penny reviewed the CAG meeting process. The public is welcome to attend and observe the meeting proceedings, however only CAG members may ask questions. A general public comment period is held at the conclusion of each meeting.

SEPTEMBER 30 MEETING FOLLOW UP

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues; Doug Playter, CH2M Hill

Penny called out two handouts (Keystone-Port Townsend 2030 Vehicle Throughput Capacity and Keystone Harbor Environmental Analysis Update), saying they were created in response to questions at the September 30 CAG meeting.

Doug Playter, CH2M Hill, expanded upon the September 30 throughput discussion and explained that the revised throughput table adds daily capacity for each vessel size as well as vessel frequency for each vessel during the high and low seasons. Vessel service hour assignments on the route are also indicated. This revised frequency includes a second Issaquah 130-class vessel for eight hours per day in the summer to provide the necessary service to accommodate riders in 2030. This change brings the throughput chart in line with capital cost estimates that show an Issaquah 130 coming on the route.

Discussion

- What does the legend of vessel hours reference at the bottom of the page [See Keystone-Port Townsend 2030 Vehicle Throughput Capacity]?

The superscript numbers in the second column (next to the hi and low season indicators), indicate the number of vessels assigned for each of the vessel options and their respective service hours.

- Have the “capacity increased” percentages changed since the September 30 CAG meeting?

Yes. All service hours were reanalyzed to align with 2030 traffic models.

- Throughput does not show available or used capacity for any average day, only the total amount of vehicles that can be accommodated on the route based on the schedule. What does it mean when the Issaquah 130 vessel scenario shows both 45- and 90-minute schedules in the high season?

In the middle of the day in 2030, a second Issaquah 130 boat would be added to increase throughput capacity. In the morning hours, the vessel would operate every 90 minutes, but in the afternoon when there is more traffic demand, a second vessel allows a sailing every 45 minutes.

- A 30-60 minute frequency is shown for the Steel Electrics and Keystone Specials. What does this mean?

This indicates three vessels would be necessary on the route by 2030. This is the maximum amount of vessels WSF could assign to the route during the high season without a second slip.

- Does a 30-60 minute schedule equal the current schedule?

No. A 30-60-minute schedule indicates sailings every half-hour out of each terminal with a total of three vessels operating on the route. Beyond 2030, a fourth boat would be needed to accommodate traffic levels, however, a fourth boat cannot be used without building additional terminal facilities.

- How much extra capacity is available in the low season today?

WSF will provide those statistics at the next meeting.

- If the baseline capacity during the low season today is 1,180 vehicles, but only 700 vehicles are carried on the route per day, it seems extravagant to keep vessels running.

Capacity is not used on an average day during the low season, but is necessary on holidays and peak weekends.

- What are the fuel costs for each of the vessels?

WSF will provide these costs to the CAG.

Doug Playter gave additional information on Ebey’s Landing National Historic Reserve and Crockett Lake based on questions posed at the September 30 CAG meeting [See Keystone Harbor Environmental Analysis Update Handout]. Between September 30 and October 13,

additional survey work was completed on Crockett Lake. The elevation of the outfall pipe is at +1.5 feet. Any dredging work done in the harbor is at -28 feet. The flow into and out of the pipe will therefore not change with increased dredging. In addition, this dredging is low enough and far enough away that the structural integrity of the tide gate will not be impacted for any of the harbor options studied.

Discussion

- What does this information mean for Ebey's Landing?

Impacts to Ebey's Landing will be taken into consideration as WSF moves forward with the environmental review process. WSF has met with the manager of Ebey's Landing. The construction of Keystone Terminal predates the designation of Ebey's Landing, which works to WSF's favor.

- The size of the parking lot adjacent to the harbor and Crockett Lake is increased under some of the vessel/harbor scenarios. Will runoff go into Crockett Lake? Is there a way to separate or detain runoff?

Currently, runoff is not treated from the parking lot and it runs into Keystone Harbor. The parking lot was built in the 1970s when runoff treatment was not required. If WSF were to remodel the parking lot, runoff would be treated according to current standards. Detention is not required for this project as all runoff directly enters Puget Sound. If runoff runs into a stream or other small body of water it must be detained. Due to the small amount of runoff and given the fact that the water is running into Puget Sound, the water does not need to be "slowed" as it runs into Keystone Harbor. WSF's treatment measures could improve water in the harbor.

- How would the water be treated?

There are several ways this water could be treated including an oil-water separator in conjunction with underground vaults or bio-swales (grass-lined ditches).

- How much surface area do the treatment methods require?

In general, the treatment would require a bio-swale 200 feet long with a bottom width of five to ten feet.

- Where would that space be located?

The treatment swale could be located in a grassy area adjacent to the parking lot on the seaward side, but that determination would be made during design.

Penny reported that in response to a question asked at the last CAG meeting, WSF had determined that construction impacts for all options other than Option 1 and Option 4 would require that service on the route be shutdown for approximately three weeks.

Discussion

- Would WSF like comments from the CAG on this follow-up information?

If the information spurs additional questions, please give Penny or WSF staff a call.

- Not all harbor options will have an equal impact on Ebey's Landing. Option 6 has the least impact, while those that require building new holding areas will have the most.

TRAFFIC

Doug Playter, CH2M Hill; Larry Demich, Demich Engineering; Tung Le, CH2M Hill

Penny Mabie explained that each area of analysis for the harbor report was driven by questions posed by WSF and the CAG earlier in the process. For traffic analysis, these included:

- What geographical parameters should be developed for traffic modeling?
- For each potential vessel type, how will the immediate area around the terminal be affected by traffic? Local neighborhoods? SR 525? Coupeville? SR 20? Port Townsend?
- For each potential vessel type, how will holding queuing and exiting be addressed?
- What accessibility issues should be addressed?
- What are the truck routes in the area and how are they impacted by ferry traffic and operations?
- Is traffic in Coupeville, Deception Pass, and the Mukilteo Ferry related to vessel capacity?

Doug Playter informed the CAG that in order to complete traffic analysis with these questions in mind, two distinct studies were done. Larry Demich, Demich Engineering, addressed holding capacity.

Holding capacity is dependent on vessel size and frequency as opposed to just vessel size. Larry showed a series of graphs indicating the number of vehicles in holding and queuing for each potential vessel over the span of a day from 2008 through 2037 [See Holding and Queuing Figures Handout]. This calculation is made to show how long cars spend at the terminal or in the queue.

Each graph uses the 30th highest day of each year as the "design day." This is the standard design day used by WSF for its projections. Lines on the graph show how many vehicles would be in holding and in the queue if there were three vessels or two vessels operating under various service plans. This allows WSF to understand how the terminal will operate during a typical design day. The dashed, horizontal line shows the threshold of number of cars in the system outnumbering the capacity of the vessel. All curved lines indicate when the queue length would overflow the holding area and times when the queue would exceed 80-vehicles outside of the tollbooths over the course of a design day. The 80-vehicle figure is used as a guideline for when the vehicle queue would extend past Fort Casey or past homes along Keystone Spit depending on which direction is ultimately used.

Discussion

- What does a queue length of 80 vehicles signify?

- *Eighty vehicles is an estimate of the queue length beyond the holding area, which would end at Fort Casey as a reference point. The top, horizontal line shows that reference point. 200 vehicles is the point when the holding area is at capacity.*

- What would the peak wait time be?

With a three-vessel Steel Electric schedule, meaning 30-minute headways, with 300 vehicles in line, that is a four-boat wait. That equals approximately 2.5 hours. For the Issaquah 130 class, capacity is higher and fewer vehicles would be left in the 200 car holding area. Many of these lines show approximately 200 vehicles waiting.

- Does this information show peak season?

Yes, this is reflective of the summer traffic.

- Has any attempt been made to manage oversize vehicles by time of day? Is there any WSF route in the system that manages these times?

The San Juan routes have a reservation system designating 60% of commercial space for over-height vehicles.

- Has the same system been applied to large, recreational vehicles on the San Juan routes?

These spots are allocated on a first come, first serve basis.

- Has there ever been discussion of the potential for a recreational vehicle reservation system to flatten the steep curves in the charts?

Yes. In 1995, WSF had a single vessel on the Keystone-Port Townsend route, so a “night watch” sailing was added with fare discounts to travel at that time. The middle of the day had crowded sailings with long waits. WSF found that many people did not switch to the late night sailings. Truckers surveyed did not alter their schedules. That summer was a slice in time with a sudden change in service, so it does not reflect long-term changes in schedule.

- Are the graphs based on current travel numbers? It would be nice to see these shown.

These numbers are based on the 2003 traffic numbers using WSF Planning Department growth rates.

- What are the growth rates?

They are variable over time. Traffic will be up 50 to 60 percent by 2030.

- Are any of the WSF routes subject to concurrency requirements?

Yes, the Mukilteo-Clinton route is required meet concurrency standards. The standard was changed from a one to two boat rate a few years ago.

- Could the numbers of this concurrency requirement be brought back to the CAG?

If available, WSF will get those numbers to the CAG as soon as possible.

Tung Le, CH2M Hill, presented intersection traffic analysis related to Keystone Terminal. This study focused on key intersections and roadway sections around the Keystone Terminal and beyond: Highway 20/Main Street; South Engle Road/Fort Casey Road; Highway 20

Spur/Keystone Ferry Terminal; Highway 20 Spur/Wanamaker Road; SR 525/Wanamaker Road; Highway 20 section, south of Deception Pass Bridge; and SR 525 section, north of the Clinton Ferry Terminal. These studies were completed last spring and summer and compared with existing WSDOT data. Each study was conducted during the peak hour on a typical summer weekday (4:00-5:00 p.m.) and weekend (12:00-1:00 p.m.). Average peak hour conditions in the Coupeville area show less than 4% of traffic heading to Keystone Terminal. On SR 20, less than 3% of all traffic travels to the Keystone Terminal. Keystone ferry traffic impacts less than 1% of traffic on SR 525 north of the Clinton Ferry Terminal. These numbers gave the baseline traffic numbers in existing conditions.

Each intersection is evaluated according to a transportation technique, which assigns level of service (LOS) ratings from A-F. “A” equals a less than five second wait at a given intersection and is the best. “F” is the worst. For all intersections in this case during the peak hour, the average LOS is C/D.

Traffic projections for the year 2030 at Deception Pass and all study locations are based on the average growth per year for the area. Overall, future traffic impacts on roadways within Coupeville would decrease as WSF assumes that traffic will travel from Keystone Terminal to SR 20/525 instead of passing through Coupeville.

Discussion

- How do you know a passenger vehicle came off the ferry and went to any given intersection?

This study is based on the total traffic count converted to percentages based on the number of trucks and other types of vehicles that exit the ferry. There are some engineering estimates. Traffic is assigned based on the percentages of traffic that head in either direction off the dock and the existing traffic turning movements at the study intersections.

- What times were chosen for analysis?

A two-hour time block on a weekday and weekend were counted, and then one peak-hour was determined for the traffic analysis.

- Do these traffic counts reflect Issaquah 130-class vessel vehicle discharges?

Yes, as well as summer peak hour conditions.

- Everything is about the peak and maximum amounts—the holding area, the congestion, etc. Frequency of schedule seems to solve most problems. Why does the number of vehicles released from a single Issaquah 130 vessel have the same impact on traffic congestion as a smaller vessel?

A similar amount of traffic will travel through during that peak hour, causing the same impact on the intersection. The smaller boat has a shorter span of time between arrivals, meaning that it will arrive twice in one hour while an Issaquah 130 will arrive once.

- Are these numbers reflective of the entire hour, rather than 15 minutes of real congestion that will be observed by drivers?

Yes.

- It would be helpful to see the peak hour collapsed down to see if an Issaquah 130 vessel has a greater impact than a smaller vessel.

WSF can collapse the peak hour information down to 15-minute intervals during the hour. Currently, on an average summer day, LOS "D" might be the rating of an intersection in Coupeville during the peak hour. This rating may get worse during a 15-minute increment, causing a longer delay. However, level of service "D" is the average for all vehicles over the course of the hour, which is generally deemed "acceptable" according to WSDOT standards.

- Is the average delay per vehicle noted in the circles on the map [See October 13 PowerPoint Presentation]?

Yes, in seconds.

- The intersection between SR 20 and SR 525 is dangerous. If the majority of vehicles are redirected to that intersection from the ferry, it would need a traffic signal.

Yes. Based on the redirection of traffic, this intersection would become an "F" rating. By 2030 a signal will be needed at this intersection with or without ferry traffic. Likewise, the existing signalized intersection in Coupeville would become LOS "F" with or without ferry traffic. This rating could improve with signal timing and improved channelization.

- When is an intersection deemed "unacceptable?"

WSDOT's level of service standards indicate that an intersection is "unacceptable" with a "D" rating in rural areas. In urban areas, level "E" is unacceptable. However, WSDOT may be moving to a different level of service standards. WSF will provide any different information to the CAG as it becomes available.

- To accommodate increased traffic, it seems improved capacity and right-of-way is needed on the highway.

That is true, however more analysis is needed. With or without ferry traffic, SR 20 and SR 525 may need additional upgrades.

- Representing the Coupeville community, it would be better to see choke points and peak traffic periods in minutes rather than an average peak hour of traffic. There may not be enough space to queue all of the vehicles at the flashing stop light near Prairie Center in Coupeville.

Within a peak hour of congestion, there are individual periods of time that are better and worse. On a peak day, most vehicles will have less than 30 seconds to wait, but this is the average situation. One day of the year might have an extraordinarily poor traffic condition, but it is not the daily traffic situation.

- The worst 15 minutes at a given intersection are the most concerning.

We will get that analysis to you for the next meeting.

- Do all of these scenarios assume a signal at the terminal?

Yes. The light would restrict through traffic on SR 20 when a ferry is unloading allowing the ferry traffic to unload without backing up.

- Since Port Townsend has been separated from the Keystone project, it will be impacted by Keystone decisions rather than considered up front. The same queuing and land acquisition concerns should be taken into account in Port Townsend as they have been in Keystone.

Port Townsend concerns will not be “after-the-fact” considerations. The CAG process is not a decision-making one for the Keystone-Port Townsend route. Following the CAG process and legislative direction, the alternatives under consideration at both ends of the route will undergo environmental review. The current harbor study applies solely to Keystone. It is an information-gathering process rather than a “decision-making” process. Port Townsend impacts will not be disregarded, but taken into account through the environmental review process.

SAFETY RESULTS

Captain Kelly Mitchell, WSF

Captain Kelly Mitchell, WSF Senior Port Captain, explained safety concerns for each of the harbor/vessel scenarios. He began by showing a video of vessels entering and leaving Keystone Harbor. The video explained that Keystone Harbor is considered an “unforgiving environment” for ferry approaches due to strong currents, extreme low tides and a narrow harbor entrance.

Due to the currents that run across the mouth of the harbor, the ferry moves across the mouth with the ebb current as the tide recedes. These forces occur simultaneously as the vessel master attempts to guide the vessel into the harbor through the easiest “hole” of dead water. The current flows almost perpendicular to the ferry’s trajectory, carrying the vessel westward toward the beach. This approach requires full speed to make headway and retain maneuverability during the approach to the terminal.

Exiting the harbor is not as dangerous as the approach. However, if there are strong southeasterly winds, the ferry can be pushed into the beach and campground area on the western edge of the harbor. Typically at the mouth of the harbor the vessel must fight the current and, consequently, side-slips at it leaves the harbor.

Captain Mitchell explained that a captain’s primary objectives are to ensure the safety of ferry passengers and people within the operational area, including Keystone Harbor, and not run aground. Once a captain makes the commitment to enter the harbor, the ferry cannot backtrack. A small boat trying to cross the path of the ferry or a scuba diver near the ferry’s path cannot be avoided after that threshold is crossed. These are serious causes for concern.

With respect to the Steel Electrics, the United States Coast Guard inspects the vessels annually. They are currently safe, 77-year old vessels. As this study projects service over a 30-year span, the age of the vessels raises a safety concern. The Steel Electrics could become unsafe in that time period due to their riveted steel hulls.

WSF Port Captains came up with seven operating concerns to apply against each of the 28 harbor/vessel scenarios to evaluate safety:

- 1. Sea State/Current Exposure During Crossing:** Vessel is expected to be adversely exposed to wind & current during crossing and/or on initial approach to Keystone Harbor.
- 2. In Dock Sea State/Current Exposure:** Vessel is expected to be adversely exposed to wind & current while at the terminal during unloading and loading operations.
- 3. Landing Limitations:** Increased draft limitations during low tidal operations.
- 4. Adverse Rebound Risk:** Location of dolphins is expected to cause an increased risk of grounding.
- 5. Restricted Visibility Approach Limitations:** Location of dock and/or difficult approach dynamics is expected to continue the closing of route during foggy conditions.
- 6. Sea State/Current Exposure:** Vessel is expected to be adversely affected by sea state and current on the approach to Keystone Harbor.
- 7. Maneuvering Limitations:** Stopping distance of vessel insufficient for expected approach.

Discussion

- Has the CAG been given formal numbers of how often groundings occur on the route?
WSF can provide these numbers since 1999, showing that Keystone has the highest numbers of groundings per year of any route. The three last reported groundings were in 2002. None have been reported since then.
- Was it after the 2002 grounding that guidelines were put in place so captains had the ¼-mile visibility check and did not have to make the decision to enter the harbor?
Yes. Additionally, the standard for sailing cancellations and schedule changes occurs when 3.5-knot tidal currents arise within a half hour of the expected time of arrival.
- Has particular emphasis been placed on any of the safety criteria?
Yes. Number 2 (In Dock Sea State/Current Exposure) and Number 4 (Adverse Rebound Risk) are of greatest concern. These relate to the vessel's exposure to wind and current while in the slip, and the risk of vessels rebounding off dolphins and consequently grounding. Dolphins can cause a ricochet effect when the vessel hits a dolphin, still has momentum, and consequently is pushed sideways in the harbor. Currently, the western beach of the harbor is the last outlet for safety, allowing the captains to "kiss" the soft gravel without coming hard aground. A ferry with a conventional propulsion system could be severely damaged if it hit one of the dolphins at an angle. A vessel with one of the new propulsion systems would be at risk of needing complete propulsion overhaul if it hit a dolphin at an angle.
- Does the sheet pile wall protect the vessels?
The sheet pile wall is behind the dolphins in Option 6 (Existing Slip with Line Dolphins). In addition, as the jetty is not extended in this option, the same current will flow across

the mouth of the harbor. If the dead water is misjudged, the vessel could be pushed across the current, hit a dolphin, and ricochet.

- For safety criteria 3 (Landing Limitations), would a larger vessel have greater potential for safety hazards?

The Steel Electrics have less weight, so a larger vessel traveling at the same speed as the Steel Electrics would carry more momentum and be more difficult to stop.

INDIRECT SYSTEM COSTS

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Penny indicated that based on Mike Thorne's discussion at the September 30 CAG Meeting, some system-wide costs had been quantified, as well as explained further. A handout with additional system costs and impacts was distributed to the CAG.

Discussion

- Are the costs for training projected over a 30-year period?

Yes.

HARBOR/VESSEL SCENARIO SCREENING

Russ East, WSF Terminal Engineering; Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues

Russ East, WSF Terminal Engineering Director, guided the CAG through a series of screening questions with the goal of screening the harbor/vessel scenarios to a manageable number. Russ discussed the factors that WSF used to suggest eliminating some scenarios. These included costs, safety, and environmental impacts. Unshaded scenarios on the scenarios matrix will be carried further into the study.

VESSEL OPTIONS	HARBOR OPTIONS					
	1. Existing Conditions	2. Existing Slip with Jetty Extension	3. Harbor Mouth Slip East State Park Terminal	4. In Harbor Slip-State Park Terminal	5. West State Park Slip and Terminal	6. Existing Slip with Line Dolphins
Maintain Steel Electrics (59 cars)	SE-1	SE-2	SE-3	SE-4	SE-5	SE-6
New/ Existing Issaquah 130 Class (133 cars)		130-2	130-3	130-4	130-5	130-6
Evergreen State or Sealith (Issaquah 100 Class - 87/90 cars)		100-2	100-3	100-4	100-5	100-6
"Keystone Special" (Same Footprint as SEs with New Propulsion System 68 cars)	KS-1	KS-2	KS-3	KS-4	KS-5	KS-6
"Out-of-the-Box" - 100 Special (100 cars)	NP-1	NP-2	NP-3	NP-4	NP-5	NP-6

Discussion:

- Does this proposal mean these scenarios are removed from analysis?
- Not completely. The analysis that has already been completed will be discussed in the final report, however, further study will continue only on the remaining scenarios. WSF would like to look closely at the scenarios they think might be viable.*
- What was the benefit of Option 4 (In Harbor Slip-State Park Terminal)?
When compared to Option 2 (Existing Slip with Jetty Extension), the slip is moved to where the terminal stood historically on the back eastern side of the harbor.
- Is a sheet pile wall a problem?
Yes. It could have impacts on fish migration.
- Why are line dolphins a safety issue for Option 6 (Existing Slip with Line Dolphins)?
The stopping area and approach remain the same as the existing conditions, so if the vessel hits a dolphin at 12 knots, it could be spun horizontally, and then could not fit in the harbor. Additionally, a ricochet effect from hitting the line dolphins on one side of the

harbor could push a vessel at an angle into the line dolphins on the other side, potentially causing damage to the vessel.

- While there are permitting problems for Option 6 with the United States Corps of Engineers, other concerns should be balanced against those specific concerns. For some other options, terminal and parking areas would likely be of concern to other permitting agencies. It would be nice to evaluate one option environmentally over another regarding its permit-ability.
- Is the intent of the report to analyze different options? Perhaps this is too much narrowing down.

WSF believes the next phase should have more focus. Over half of the scenarios have been cut, which is a good start. This may not all be settled tonight. For the options that remain questionable to eliminate, they will be kept and analyzed.

- The solution may be incremental, since the Steel Electrics will not last forever. But perhaps they will last 10 years.

Penny asked CAG members if they were in agreement with the screening results, and all CAG members expressed concurrence with the screening results.

Doug MacDonald, Washington State Secretary of Transportation and Acting CEO of WSF, introduced himself to the CAG and give the overall picture of how Keystone fits into the WSF budget. The Keystone discussion does not occur in a vacuum, and constraints of how money is spent in the system will constrict this project—no matter the outcome of the harbor study. Some concerns over potential scenarios relate to the lack of funding for them. Three years ago, the Washington State Legislature earmarked funds to procure four new 130-class vessels. The Legislature gave a short funding timeline for the vessel procurement, and did not anticipate WSF coming back in 2005 to request funding for additional vessels. Having additional vessels that function like Steel Electrics will leave the route in the same condition, not improved.

Currently, WSF is continuing vessel acquisition. The CAG timeline (and Keystone/Steel Electric retirement timeline) and the timeline of new vessels are now disconnected. These will have to be reconciled. Additionally, WSF's goal is to achieve flexibility for its operations. As funding for the system is not growing operationally or from the Legislature, the system must operate on a tight budget. The rising costs of fuel pose additional operational constraints. These new costs will be phased into WSF's operating assumptions. The Legislature can also affect these costs by imposing higher gas taxes or fares.

Not all of the operational decisions to be made at Keystone are indicated on the vessel/harbor scenario matrix. The scenarios that are operationally feasible will face budget constraints.

DRAFT FINAL REPORT OUTLINE & CAG CONVERSATION

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues; Doug MacDonald, Washington State Secretary of Transportation; CAG Members

Penny asked the CAG to look over the Harbor Report Outline. The CAG will be asked to develop a product to submit to the report and reflect their participation in the process. This will be the focus of the final CAG meeting.

Discussion

- How will the CAG write a letter together?

One option would be for a designated member of the CAG to write agreed-upon common concerns and interests in the analysis; another would have individually-written pieces compiled into one product.

- Will this be completed at the next meeting?

CAG members should think about the contents for the next meeting, then at the meeting we will work to come to agreement on the contents and how to compile the information.

Penny asked each of the CAG members to offer their comments on the process and what they might like to add to the report.

Forest Shomer expressed his response to money concerns for the system. The CAG cannot tell the Legislature how to appropriate funds. More roads accommodating more cars, more ferries holding more cars, and together using a depleting fuel supply is a bigger problem. The Legislature should help solve this problem, which is not unique to Washington State. This state could be the first to re-envision a transportation system with alternatives to oil, alternative propulsion systems for vehicles, and tax incentives to use them. The Legislature should set a new course with a new system.

Doug MacDonald responded that a fundamental problem for transportation today is the one Forest posed. The geography in the United States is organized around the automobile. Alternative auto methods will still use the same system of roads, as will the ferries. WSF has already committed to using cleaner fuels, and has accomplished this ahead of schedule. Whether in Coupeville, Port Townsend, Port Angeles, or the Olympic Peninsula, the transportation system must grapple with “automobility” versus “Plan B.” For WSF to propose changing the route to accommodate fewer cars would require a much broader public discussion. This is a statewide issue, shaping communities and the economy today. This route decision and harbor decision is not the place to worry about 2030 transportation in Port Townsend and beyond.

Tim McGuire expressed his concerns over the price of a potential project tied with the difficulty of sailing into Keystone Harbor. At the September 30 meeting, costs presented for all the scenarios showed the lowest total cost around \$530 million. WSF has told the CAG that the additional money does not exist. This route should stay in existence, however, none of these harbor options are preferable for a master. Keystone Harbor is hard to sail into, and it would be

preferable not to have the terminal located in the harbor at all. The alternatives presented in the scoping process last year were more preferable, more cost effective, and get the terminal out of the harbor.

Nancy Conard expressed her opinion of the scenario possibilities. In simple terms, WSF aimed at standardization, which is admirable. But the proposed 130-class vessel does not fit into the harbor as it is currently configured, so WSF began to study moving the terminal out of the harbor, producing public opposition. There can be a 130-class vessel on the route, however it should stay in Keystone Harbor. This transition could happen incrementally, but the upland footprint on the Keystone side of the route should not be expanded. The Steel Electrics should be run as long as possible. If the current schedule can be maintained with a similar footprint and queue area, overall this will be a good result. But the final result does not need to be in place next year. The current traffic levels could hold steady or lessen. Money should be spent in the harbor to bring the vessels in. WSF should also be given the most options possible to make this happen, which will allow the options to transition into a workable solution. The environmental impacts must also be known for each scenario.

Discussion:

- What is the agenda for the next meeting? Will there be time to get everything done that needs to be accomplished?

The Transportation Commission will have a meeting in November and will be briefed on this project, and the report is due to the Legislative Transportation Committee on December 1. However, the CAG should not artificially hold itself to that date if additional discussions are desired.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment #1: Robin Adams

I got interested in this project because of my environmental concerns. However, now my greatest concern is cost. The lowest priced vessel shown at the September 30 meeting was \$11 million dollars lower than the highest priced vessel, which is the Issaquah 130 vessel. That option still requires a second 130 in 2030 to accommodate traffic, increasing the overall scenario price tag. The time value of the money is not shown in the data, and the differential cost of the vessels will diminish over time. As a professional economist, the NP-1 is the most cost-efficient solution, and has the least environmental concerns as well. It is also the best from a service perspective because it will leave every 45 minutes.

I am surprised there is no difference in safety concerns between the Out-of-Box 100 Special and the current fleet. When making those judgments, did the captains have sufficient knowledge of these vessels? I think two or three captains should travel to Finland, where the vessel was from, get a feel for how the vessels perform, and reevaluate. That investment in research would be well-spent at \$10,000.00.

Public Comment #2: Julie Jaman (read verbatim from letter to CAG)

To: Keystone CAG
From: Julie Jaman – Citizen, Jefferson County

- 1) My experience is that smaller ferries (59 car) with a more frequent sailing would accommodate our needs rather than ganging up a myriad cars in non-existent parking.
- 2) Smaller ferries would not require the multi-million dollar changes at Keystone freeing up that money for operations.
- 3) A change in schedule so that the ferry is not dumping cars into our 5 o'clock traffic rush. Imagine larger ferries dumping a hundred cars onto Water Street at 5 o'clock rush—car to car all the way up Sims Way.
- 4) Wouldn't it be nice to have a local food vendor on our local ferry; known for certain specialties.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.